

Ser. No. 10/733,544

#### Remarks

Claims 1-20 were pending in the application. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-16, 18, and 20 were rejected. Claims 2, 5, 17, and 19 were merely objected to and no claims were allowed. By the foregoing amendment, claims 5, 17, and 19 are canceled, claims 1, 4, 13, and 14 are amended, and claims 21 and 22 are added. No new matter is presented.

#### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2, 5, 17, and 19. The foregoing amendment incorporates claim 5 into claim 1 in the absence of intervening claim 4. Claim 17 (and identical 19) are incorporated into claim 14 without the elements of intervening claims 16 and 18, respectively. The subject matter of the intervening claims was not indicated as critical to the finding of patentability. Claim 2 has been re-presented in independent form as new claim 21.

#### Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112(2). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

At page 2 of the Office action, it was asserted as unclear whether the term "means for movably supporting..." referred to FIG. 6 or FIG. 2. It was further indicated that "the Examiner assumes the recitation to refer to fig. 2..." Applicants are confused by this because FIGS. 2 and 6 show similar means (namely, trolleys). However, FIG. 7 shows alternative means as hangers. Furthermore, there is no indefiniteness when a specification identifies alternative structures for performing a given function. This is believed an advantage of means-plus-function language.

#### Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1, 3, and 7-9 were rejected as being anticipated by Hunter, Jr. (US5494004). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The claims as was were believed patentable for the reasons previously mentioned. Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing examination, the foregoing amendment is believed to render the objections moot.

Ser. No. 10/733,544

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunter, Jr. in view of Chappell (US3216046). Claims 4 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunter, Jr. in view of Menegaz et al. (US4095935). Claims 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chappell. Claims 18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chappell in view of Menegaz. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

The claims as-was were believed patentable for the reasons previously mentioned. Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing examination, the foregoing amendment is believed to render the objections moot.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1-4, 6-16, 18, and 20-22 are in condition for allowance. Please charge any fees or deficiency or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account of record.

Respectfully submitted,

By William B. Slate  
William B. Slate  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No.: 37,238

Telephone: 203-777-6628  
Telefax: 203-865-0297

Date: September 26, 2007

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted this 26<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2007 to the USPTO, at Fax No. 571-273-8300.

Antoinette Sullo  
Antoinette Sullo